### PATENT COOPERATION TREA TREE 1 2 JUL 2004

**PCT** 

**21** JAN 2005

# INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

	Applicant's or agent's file reference 4-32586A International application No.		FOR FURTHER ACTION  See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)					
Inter			International filing date (day/month/year) 23.05.2003		Priority date (day/month/year)			
PCT/IB 03/01985		)1985			24.07.2002			
	national F K31/50		ooth national classification and IP	С				
	licant VARTIS	S AG	Nto	is a second	-10			
1.	This in Author	ternational preliminary exa ity and is transmitted to the	amination report has been pre e applicant according to Artic	pared by this e 36.	International Preliminary Examining			
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 5 sheets, including this cover sheet.							
	This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e. sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).							
	These annexes consist of a total of sheets.							
3.	This re	eport contains indications r	relating to the following items:					
3.		eport contains indications r ☑ Basis of the opinion	relating to the following items:					
3.	1 0	<ul><li>☑ Basis of the opinion</li><li>☑ Priority</li></ul>						
3.	) [	<ul><li>☑ Basis of the opinion</li><li>☑ Priority</li></ul>		y, inventive s	tep and industrial applicability			
3.	1 0 11 0 101 0	<ul><li>☑ Basis of the opinion</li><li>☑ Priority</li><li>☑ Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inventor</li></ul>	f opinion with regard to novelt					
3.	I [ II [ IV [	Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of invent	f opinion with regard to novelt	gard to novel				
3.		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of invent	f opinion with regard to noveli ntion t under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with re ations supporting such statem	gard to novel				
3.		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of invention Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents c	f opinion with regard to noveli ntion t under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with re ations supporting such statem	gard to novel				
3.		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of invent Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents c Certain defects in the	f opinion with regard to novel ntion t under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with re ations supporting such statem ited	gard to novel ent				
3.		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of invent Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents c Certain defects in the	of opinion with regard to novelination  t under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with relations supporting such statemented  e international application  s on the international application	gard to novel ent on	ity, inventive step or industrial applicability;			
		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of invent Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents c Certain defects in the	of opinion with regard to novelination  t under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with relations supporting such statemented  e international application  s on the international application	gard to novel ent on	tep and industrial applicability  ity, inventive step or industrial applicability;  n of this report			
Dat		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inventions and explanations and explanations and explanations and explanations and explanations and explanations are certain defects in the Certain observations	of opinion with regard to novelination the under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with restions supporting such statemented the international application to on the international application  Da	gard to novel ent on	ity, inventive step or industrial applicability;			
Dat 24.		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inventions and explanations and explanations and explanations and explanations and explanations and explanations are certain defects in the Certain observations Certain observations  dission of the demand	of opinion with regard to novelination the under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with relations supporting such statemented e international application on the international application Date of the international application	gard to novel ent on e of completion	ity, inventive step or industrial applicability;			
Dat 24.		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inventions and explanations and explanations and explanations and explanations and explanations and explanations are certain defects in the Certain observations	of opinion with regard to novel to nation the under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with relations supporting such statemented the international application to on the international application  Date  Open	gard to novelent on e of completion	ity, inventive step or industrial applicability;			

## INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/IB 03/01985

I. Basis	of the	report
----------	--------	--------

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application (Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17)):

	Des	cription, Pages						
	1-16		as originally filed					
	Ol -:	Mumbara	•					
		ms, Numbers	gravitation (IV) Clad					
	1-8		as originally filed					
2.	With lang	ith regard to the <b>language</b> , all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the nguage in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.						
	The	se elements were ava	lable or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:					
		the language of a tra	slation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).					
		the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).						
		the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).						
3.	With inter	n regard to any <b>nucle</b> o mational preliminary e	tide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the camination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:					
		contained in the inter	ational application in written form.					
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.						
		furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.						
		furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.						
		The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.						
		The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequenc listing has been furnished.						
4.	The	amendments have re	sulted in the cancellation of:					
		the description,	pages:					
		the claims,	Nos.:					
		the drawings,	sheets:					
5.		This report has been been considered to g	established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)).					
		(Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to the report.)						
6.	Add	litional observations, i	necessary:					

#### INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY **EXAMINATION REPORT**

International application No.

PCT/IB 03/01985

- V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- 1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

1-8

No:

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

Claims

1-8

Claims No:

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-8 (cf. text)

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

### INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY **EXAMINATION REPORT - SEPARATE SHEET**

D1: J.Clin.Endocrinology & Metabolism 88, 1889-1896 (2003) - P-document

D2: Database Biosis Abstract no. PREV200300111240

Surgery 132, 960-967 (2002) - P-document

D3: Ann. Med. 33, 451-455 (2001)

D4: WO 99/03854

Item V:

- If the priority of the application is not valid (not checked) document D1 and D2 1. (articles) can be used against novelty/Inventive step of the claimed subject-matter.
- The use of compound I free base and compound I mesylate ("Imatinib 2.. mesylate"=Gleevec=Glivec=STI571=STI-571) for the treatment of cancer is known from documents D3-D4.

Document D3 is a review article about Imatinib as an anticancer agent for solid tumours which discloses the known activity of this compound against chronic myeloid leukemia, Philadelphia chromosome-positive acute lymphoblastic leukemia and gastrointestinal stromal tumours.

Imatinib is a known inhibitor of a few tyrosine kinases including KIT. D3 states that "KIT may be overexpressed in many types of human solid tumours, such as small-cell lung carcoinoma, melanoma, seminoma, some carcinomas, and adenoid cystic carcinomas, but the role of KIT in the pathogenesis of these tumours is not yet known." (emphasis added by the International Preliminary Examining Authority).

D4 indicates that imatinib is active against gliomas, sarcomas, prostate tumours, and tumours of the colon, breast, and ovary and against BCR-abl-positive cancer and tumour diseases such as leukemias but no pharmacological experimental data are contained in this document.

The problem to be solved by the invention was the provision of a medicament which is effective against anaplastic thyroid carcinomas.

In view of the relevant state of the art documents D3 and D4 as described above it



International application No. PCT/IB 03/01985

appears that there was no way to know at the priority date with a reasonable degree of certainty if imatinib could also be effective against anaplastic thyroid carcinoma, i.e. there was no reasonable expectation of success.

The applicant has shown the effectiveness of imatinib against thyroid anaplastic carcinomas both by in vitro and in vivo experiments.

In view of the above an inventive step can be acknowledged for subject-matter claimed in claims 1-8.

3. For the assessment of the present claims 3-8 on the question whether they are industrially applicable, no unified criteria exist in the PCT Contracting States. The patentability can also be dependent upon the formulation of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognize as industrially applicable the subject-matter of claims to the use of a compound in medical treatment, but may allow, however, claims to a known compound for first use in medical treatment and the use of such a compound for the manufacture of a medicament for a new medical treatment.